

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393
Title II Project Submission Form
Northeast Oregon Forests Resource Advisory
Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by Designated Federal Official): **GR-MAL04-105**

2. Project Name: Aspen Enclosure and Riparian Pasture Fence Maintenance	3. County: Grant
4. Project Sponsor: Blue Mountain Ranger District	5. Date: 10/31/2002
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: Michael Montgomery 541-575-3401	
7. Sponsors E-mail: mmontgomery02@fs.fed.us (project contact: Cindy Kranich 541-575-3391)	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Middlefork John Day 17070203, Upper John Day 17070201, Silvies 17120002	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): District-wide	
c. Location: Township: _Fences are located district-wide.	
d. BLM District	e. BLM Resource Area
f. National Forest: Malheur National Forest	g. Forest Service District: Blue Mountain Ranger District
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

<p>9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines)</p> <p>Approximately 200 fences protecting aspen stands, riparian areas, wet meadows, and vegetation study plots exist on the Blue Mountain Ranger District. The number of fences increases each year with additional restoration projects. Past maintenance has been sporadic due to lack of funding. We would like to inspect and maintain a portion of these fences annually to reduce the amount of work necessary any given year, and ensure all fences have been checked and are functioning as intended.</p>
<p>10. Project Description: (max. 30 lines.)</p> <p>Inspect and conduct annual maintenance as needed on district aspen, wildlife, and riparian pasture fences located district-wide. Size of these exclosures range from 0.25 acres to 20 acres; construction can be of buck and pole, 3- or 4-strand barbwire, smooth wire, or stock wire materials. Maintenance will consist of walking the perimeter of all fences, cutting out fallen trees and replacing broken poles or wire, stretching sagging wire fences, or replacing entire sections of fence broken down by elk or cattle. Fences that are no longer needed will be removed. During inspection, photos will be taken of each site, eliminating the need for a separate trip to monitor condition of the vegetation within the enclosure.</p> <p>A total of 70 fences were inspected, maintained, or rebuilt as needed during the 30-day period in 2002. A similar target is anticipated for 2003, with additional rebuilding in 2003 and 2004 of nine aspen fences damaged by the Flagtail Fire. One wildlife exclosure on Camp Creek was inspected and maintained to be functional in 2002: this fence will need most of the wooden components replaced in</p>

2004.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

☐ Yes ☒ No **If yes, then describe** (max. 10 lines)

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

☒ Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]

☒ Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]

☒ Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]

☒ Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

☐ Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☐ Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

☒ Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)] Fence maintenance

☐ Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]

☐ Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]

☐ Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]

☐ Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

☐ Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

☐ Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]

☐ Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]

☐ Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

a. Total Acres:

b. Total Miles:

c. No. Structures: 50 to 75 annually, depending on maintenance needs of individual fences. Some fences built with KV dollars are 20 years old and require more work than fences constructed within the last five years.

d. Est. People Reached
(for environmental education projects):

e. No. Laborer Days: 90 (3-person crew employed for 30 days)

f. Other (specify):

15. Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] by September 30 of each fiscal year

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) (max. 7 lines) Riparian pastures protect vegetation and stream bank stability of reaches of creeks important to spawning anadromous and non-anadromous fish. Aspen fences protect aspen suckers from continued overgrazing by elk, deer, and cattle, allowing recruitment of young aspen. These fences often also protect springs or seep areas and the diversity of vegetation associated with aspen sites. Wildlife exclosures provide control areas where vegetation can be monitored without grazing pressure of any kind. Spring and wet meadow exclosures protect unique wetland vegetation from trampling and compaction by ungulates and enhance water storage at headwater sources of many drainages.

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)] (max. 12 lines)

Viable and healthy ecosystems benefit all forest users and adjacent private landowners. Healthy watersheds with good storage capacity provide critical late season flows. Aspen stands, once restored, provide valuable late season and early spring forage for deer and elk, as well as nesting and foraging habitat for birds and a variety of small mammals. Healthy fisheries and viable populations of wildlife and bird species using these unique habitats are all integral parts of the ecosystem. Maintaining all the “parts” means a more vibrant and resilient system, which we as campers, hikers, hunters, bird watchers, fishermen, and scientists can all use and enjoy.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.** (max. 12 lines) All fences are in place to restore and enhance watershed and forest ecosystem health by protecting wetland and wet meadows, critical fish habitat, unique wildlife habitat, and important plant communities. This project allows us to maintain these existing structures to make sure they are meeting these objectives, while providing an employment opportunity for the local community during the summer field season.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines)

not applicable; pertains to projects implemented on non-federal lands. See instructions.

20. Status of Project Planning

a. NEPA Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	X Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	X Not Applicable
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	X Not Applicable
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	X Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	X Not Applicable

* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (*check those that apply*)

<input type="checkbox"/> Contract	X Federal Workforce (9 days) crew hiring, field inspections, final report on work accomplished
<input type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
X Other (specify): summer temporary workforce (local hiring; 90 laborer days), materials purchased locally	

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

☐ Yes X No

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$17203.00	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? XYes No If yes, then display by fiscal year	
c. FY02 Request: \$16,702	f. FY05 Request: \$17,719.00
d. FY03 Request: \$16,702	g. FY06 Request: Costs should be reduced, as all fences will have been through the maintenance cycle at least once by this time. Costs may be adjusted after initial three years of maintenance has been accomplished.
e. FY04 Request: \$17,203.00	

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis:

Item	<i>Column A</i> Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column B</i> Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column C</i> Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	<i>Column D</i> Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys				
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering				
28. Contract Preparation				
29. Contract Administration				
30. Contract Cost				
31. Workforce Cost	\$1000.00	\$12675.00		\$13675.00
32. Materials & Supplies		\$1254.00		\$1254.00
33. Monitoring (fence inspections)		\$950.00		\$950.00
34. Other (vehicle operating costs: \$900.00; chainsaw and tool maintenance: \$150.00)		\$1050.00		\$1050.00

Version: April 13, 2001

35. Project Sub-Total	\$1000.00	\$15929.00		\$16929.00
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8%) (per year for multi-year projects)	\$262.00	\$1,274.00		\$1536.00
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$1,262.00	\$17,203.00		\$18,465.00

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines)

Oregon Department of Corrections Inmate Work Program may be scheduled for up to five days to provide additional labor at greatly reduced cost (\$371.00/day for 10-person crew) to help with some of the larger fence rebuilding projects. This resource allows us to leverage dollars while providing work experience for inmates participating in this program. We have used these crews in the past to work with our own crews, and they have done an excellent job for us. Some monies were also requested to purchase pole materials for replacement of damaged aspen fences within the Flagtail Fire area.

39. Monitoring Plan [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

- a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)**

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?:

The Blue Mountain Ranger District biological technician (crew coordinator) will be responsible for providing work assignments to the crew and inspecting fences.

- b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)**

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: _____

The Blue Mountain Ranger District Resources Department has traditionally hired summer crews to complete field projects. We have employed senior citizens, displaced mill workers, college students, and Youth Conservation Corps crews. A diversity of background, age, and experience provides a diversity of skills and knowledge we can draw upon to get the job done. The Blue Mountain District biological technician is responsible for crew hiring.

c.

- d. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] (max. 7 lines)**

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: Not applicable

- e. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33) (max. 7 lines)**

Amount **\$950.00**

Blue Mountain Ranger District Biological Technician will inspect fences for proper maintenance, update district records, catalog photos.

Project Name: Aspen Enclosure and Riparian Pasture Fence Maintenance

County Commissioner Concurrence

(Majority required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of Grant County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the Northeast Oregon Forests Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Commissioner

Date

Priority Rating:

X High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

Comments/Rational: